## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

TIMOTHY CROWLEY,

Plaintiff,

**ORDER** 

v.

15-cv-006-wmc

STUN-TECH INC., KARBON ARMS, STINGER SYSTEMS, INC., ELECTRONIC DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES LLC, R.A.C.C. INDUSTRIES INC., CCI PRISON FACILITY

## Defendants.

The court is in receipt of counsel's letter providing an update on the results of his investigation into the manufacturer of the stun system that shocked plaintiff, which the court assumes was also provided to plaintiff. (Dkt. #32.) Based on counsel's conclusion that there is no defendant from whom plaintiff can practically recover monetary damages, even assuming liability, the court deems counsel's limited obligation to assist plaintiff in drafting an amended complaint discharged. (See Dkt. #26.) Although probably unnecessary given the limitations of the original engagement, the court will also construe counsel's request as a motion to withdraw, which is GRANTED, except that counsel is to provide a copy of this order to plaintiff.

Because recovery for plaintiff from this suit appears unlikely, and there is currently no remaining defendant for whom service can be accomplished, it is unclear on what basis plaintiff could continue. However, that is for plaintiff to assess. Accordingly, plaintiff -- himself, not through counsel -- shall have until December 20, 2017, to explain to the court whether he is willing to consent to dismissal of the remainder of his case, and if not, on

what basis he should be allowed to proceed *and* against what defendant. A failure to respond, or providing a response that offers an insufficient factual or legal basis to proceed, will likely result in dismissal of this case without prejudice to refiling, understanding that the statute of limitations may bar a later-filed lawsuit. The court recognizes that this is

## **ORDER**

not the result plaintiff sought, but unfortunately not all injuries have a meaningful remedy.

IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1) Attorney Casper is DISCHARGED, subject to the above.
- 2) Plaintiff shall have until December 20, 2017, to show cause why this case should not be dismissed in its entirety.

Entered this 20th day of November, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

WILLIAM M. CONLEY District Judge